

Panel review is requested based on Applicant's position that the Examiner has failed to show that Larsson (US 6,697,638) anticipates the claimed invention in making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Please refer to the Response to Office Action filed by Applicant on October 20, 2008, at pages 4-6, for example, for relevant arguments made of record by Applicant.

The Examiner persists in mischaracterizing the Applicant's position as depending on the notion that the mere discontinuance of a communication session is, by itself, innovative. However, Applicant maintains the position that the claims recite, and Larsson fails to teach, an embedded phone that, using information identifying the mobile phone received during communication with the mobile phone, is able to communicate with the wireless network associated with the mobile phone after the embedded phone and mobile phone have ceased communicating with one another.

Accordingly, the Applicant's attorney respectfully submits that the Larsson reference does not anticipate the claimed invention.